



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,520	07/28/2003	Herbert Reyes	PU2153	1519
23454	7590	09/20/2004	EXAMINER	
CALLAWAY GOLF COMPANY 2180 RUTHERFORD ROAD CARLSBAD, CA 92008-7328			PASSANITI, SEBASTIANO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3711	

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/604,520	REYES ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Sebastiano Passaniti	3711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### **Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on see detailed Office action.

2a)  This action is FINAL.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6)  Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.  
7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:

1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07/28/03.

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_ .

5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)  Other: \_\_\_\_ .

## DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is responsive to communication received 07/28/2003 – application papers filed and IDS received.

This application is a CIP of 10/065,147, filed 09/20/2002, now U.S. Patent No. 6,769,998.

Claims 1-20 are pending.

Following is an action on the MERITS:

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-7, 9 and 11-20 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/605,535. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the '535 application merely define the invention in a slightly diverse manner. For example, and with respect to instant claim 1, note that the '535 application details a "top wall" in independent claim 1, while the instant claims do not require a top wall until the

subsequent recitation in claim 2. However, it is clear that the existence of a top wall between the heel and toe end in an iron golf club is so routinely incorporated within this art, that the absence of a “top wall” from claim 1 of the instant application or inclusion of a “top wall” in claim 1 of the ‘535 application does not patentably distinguish the claims, one from the other.

Regarding the remaining claims and with respect to instant claims 3-7, note claims 3-7, respectively, of the ‘535 application.

As to instant claim 9, note claim 9 of the ‘535 application.

As to instant claims 11-20, note claims 11-20, respectively, of the ‘535 application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-7, 9 and 11-20 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/708,387. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the ‘387 application merely differ from the instant claimed invention in that the claims of the ‘387 device set forth a specific non-metal material, namely, a thermoplastic polyester polyurethane having a Shore D hardness ranging from 50-65 (hereinafter referred to as TTP). The recitation of “non-metal material” in the instant claims is deemed to encompass the more limited recitation of a (TPP). Moreover, the skilled artisan, realizing the specific characteristics of a material that is to be used as a central member

in an iron golf club head, would have been able to select a material that is best suited for the manner in which the central member is to function. In other words, if the central member is to be made of non-metal material that cushions the impact of a golf ball with the striking face, than one skilled in the art would have found it obvious to select a material having sufficient damping qualities. If on the other hand, the skilled artisan had desired to make use of a non-metal material for the purpose of reducing the overall weight of the club head, than one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to select a polymer material that exhibits strength and is lightweight in order to meet the design criteria for the club head. It is well established in the Patent Laws that the selection of a material to take advantage of its natural characteristics would have been an obvious design choice for the skilled artisan. See In re Hopkins 145 USPQ 140.

With respect to the remaining limitations in the instant claims and regarding instant claims 3-7, see claims 3-7, respectively, of the '387 application.

With respect to the remaining limitations in the instant claims and regarding instant claims 9 and 11-20, see claims 9 and 11-20, respectively, of the '387 application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19 and 20 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of copending Application No. 10/065,233. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between the claimed invention of the '233 application and the instant claims

is that the claimed invention of the '233 application sets forth a further recitation that the width of the sole range from 0.060 inch to 1.50 inches in both claims 1 and 11.

Moreover, the claimed invention presented in claim 7 of the '233 application differs from the claimed invention detailed in claim 13 of the present application in that the '233 application recites slightly different % values for the volume percentage of the central member and the mass percentage of the club head. Further, the claims of the '233 application do not set forth the limitation of a top wall found in instant claims 2, 14 and 19.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to include a sole dimension in the '233 application, as the claimed sole width sets forth a range that is typical for iron-type club heads. The skilled artisan would have found it obvious to vary the sole width based upon specific golfing parameters. For example, irons in a set of clubs often vary in sole width based upon the shaft length and loft angle of the club head, this in response to varying requirements for the follow-through portion of a swing based upon the desired ball trajectory and optimal flight distance of a struck ball.

Moreover, the sole width will affect the drag on the club and thus the skilled artisan would have found it obvious to vary the width within a range to adjust the amount of drag. Additionally, the skilled artisan would have found it obvious to vary the mass percentage of the club head and the volume percentage of the central member of the '233 device based upon specific weight requirements for an individual golfer. Further, it is clear that the existence of a top wall between the heel and toe end in an iron golf club is so routinely incorporated within this art, that the absence of a "top wall" from the

claims of the '233 application or inclusion of a "top wall" in instant claims 2, 14 and 19 does not patentably distinguish the claims, one from the other.

With respect to instant claim 7, note claim 2 of the '233 application.

With respect to instant claim 8, see claim 3 of the '233 application.

With respect to instant claim 12, see claim 8 of the '233 application.

With respect to instant claim 13, see claim 7 of the '233 application.

With respect to instant claims 18 and 20, see claims 5, 9 and 11 of the '233 application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19 and 20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,769,998. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between the claimed invention of the '998 Patent and the instant claims is that the claimed invention of the '998 Patent (notably claim 1) sets forth a further recitation that a flange extends from the top surface. This feature is detailed for the first time in claim 10 of the instant set of claims. Thus, claim 1 of the '998 Patent, being more specific than the instant claims, includes all of the limitations of instant claim 1. Moreover, the claimed invention presented in claim 7 of the '998 Patent differs from the claimed invention detailed in claim 13 of the present application in that the '998 Patent recites slightly different % values for the volume percentage of the central member and the

mass percentage of the club head. Further, the claims of the '998 Patent do not set forth the limitation of a top wall found in instant claims 2, 14 and 19. The skilled artisan would have found it obvious to vary the mass percentage of the club head and the volume percentage of the central member of the '233 device based upon specific weight requirements for an individual golfer. Further, it is clear that the existence of a top wall between the heel and toe end in an iron golf club is so routinely incorporated within this art, that the absence of a "top wall" from the claims of the '233 application or inclusion of a "top wall" in instant claims 2, 14 and 19 does not patentably distinguish the claims, one from the other.

With respect to instant claim 7, note claim 2 of the '998 Patent.

With respect to instant claim 8, see claim 3 of the '998 Patent.

With respect to instant claim 12, see claim 8 of the '998 Patent.

With respect to instant claim 13, see claim 7 of the '998 Patent.

With respect to instant claims 18 and 20, see claims 5, 9 and 11 of the '998 Patent.

Enclosed with this Office action is a sample terminal disclaimer which is effective to overcome a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection over a pending application (37 CFR 1.321(b) and (c)).

Also enclosed is a sample Statement Under 37 CFR 3.73(b) (Form PTO/SB/96) which an assignee may use in order to ensure compliance with the rule. Part A of the Statement is used when there is a single assignment from the inventor(s). Part B of the Statement is used when there is a chain of title. The "Copies of assignments..." box should be checked when the assignment document(s) (set forth in part A or part B) is/are not recorded in the Office, and a copy of the assignment document(s) is/are attached. When the "Copies of assignments..." box is checked, either the part A box or the part B box, as appropriate, must be checked, and the "Reel\_\_\_\_\_, Frame\_\_\_\_\_" entries should be left blank. If the part B box is checked, and copies of assignments are not included, the "From:\_\_\_\_\_ To:\_\_\_\_\_ " blank(s) must be filled in. This

statement should be used the first time an assignee seeks to take action in an application under 37 CFR 3.73(b), e.g., when signing a terminal disclaimer or a power of attorney.

Enclosed with this Office action is a sample terminal disclaimer which is effective to overcome an obviousness-type double patenting rejection over a prior patent (37 CFR 1.1321(b) and (c)).

Also enclosed is a sample Statement Under 37 CFR 3.73(b) (Form PTO/SB/96) which an assignee may use in order to ensure compliance with the rule. Part A of the Statement is used when there is a single assignment from the inventor(s). Part B of the Statement is used when there is a chain of title. The "Copies of assignments..." box should be checked when the assignment document(s) (set forth in part A or part B) is/are not recorded in the Office, and a copy of the assignment document(s) is/are attached. When the "Copies of assignments..." box is checked, either the part A box or the part B box, as appropriate, must be checked, and the "Reel\_\_\_\_\_, Frame\_\_\_\_\_" entries should be left blank. If the part B box is checked, and copies of assignments are not included, the "From: \_\_\_\_\_ To: \_\_\_\_\_" blank(s) must be filled in. This statement should be used the first time an assignee seeks to take action in an application under 37 CFR 3.73(b), e.g., when signing a terminal disclaimer or a power of attorney.

All references cited during prosecution of applicant's prior application serial numbers 10/065,147, 10/065,233 and 10/605,535 are deemed pertinent to this instant application and are incorporated herein by reference.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sebastiano Passaniti whose telephone number is 703-308-1006. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (6:30-3:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Vidovich can be reached on 703-308-1513. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Sebastiano Passaniti  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3711

S.Passaniti/sp  
September 15, 2004

PTO/SB/26 (10-00)

Approved for use 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<b>TERMINAL DISCLAIMER TO OBTAIN A DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION OVER A PRIOR PATENT</b>		Docket Number (Optional)
---	--	--------------------------

In re Application of:

Application No.:

Filed:

For:

The owner\*, \_\_\_\_\_, of \_\_\_\_\_ percent interest in the instant application hereby disclaims, except as provided below, the terminal part of the statutory term of any patent granted on the instant application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of the full statutory term defined in 35 U.S.C. 154 to 156 and 173, as presently shortened by any terminal disclaimer, of prior Patent No. \_\_\_\_\_. The owner hereby agrees that any patent so granted on the instant application shall be enforceable only for and during such period that it and the prior patent are commonly owned. This agreement runs with any patent granted on the instant application and is binding upon the grantee, its successors or assigns.

In making the above disclaimer, the owner does not disclaim the terminal part of any patent granted on the instant application that would extend to the expiration date of the full statutory term as defined in 35 U.S.C. 154 to 156 and 173 of the prior patent, as presently shortened by any terminal disclaimer, in the event that it later expires for failure to pay a maintenance fee, is held unenforceable, is found invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, is statutorily disclaimed in whole or terminally disclaimed under 37 CFR 1.321, has all claims canceled by a reexamination certificate, is reissued, or is in any manner terminated prior to the expiration of its full statutory term as presently shortened by any terminal disclaimer.

Check either box 1 or 2 below, if appropriate.

1.  For submissions on behalf of an organization (e.g., corporation, partnership, university, government agency, etc.), the undersigned is empowered to act on behalf of the organization.

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

2.  The undersigned is an attorney or agent of record.

Signature

Date

Typed or printed name

Terminal disclaimer fee under 37 CFR 1.20(d) included.

**WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.**

\*Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is required if terminal disclaimer is signed by the assignee (owner). Form PTO/SB/96 may be used for making this certification. See MPEP § 324.

**Burden Hour Statement:** This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Box Patent Application, Washington, DC 20231.

PTO/SB/25 (10-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TERMINAL DISCLAIMER TO OBLIGATE A PROVISIONAL DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION OVER A PENDING SECOND APPLICATION	Docket Number (Optional)
<p>In re Application of:</p> <p>Application No.:</p> <p>Filed:</p> <p>For:</p> <p>The owner*, _____, of _____ percent interest in the instant application hereby disclaims, except as provided below, the terminal part of the statutory term of any patent granted on the instant application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of the full statutory term defined in 35 U.S.C. 154 to 156 and 173 as shortened by any terminal disclaimer filed prior to the grant of any patent granted on pending second Application Number _____, filed on _____, of any patent on the pending second application. The owner hereby agrees that any patent so granted on the instant application shall be enforceable only for and during such period that it and any patent granted on the second application are commonly owned. This agreement runs with any patent granted on the instant application and is binding upon the grantee, its successors or assigns.</p> <p>In making the above disclaimer, the owner does not disclaim the terminal part of any patent granted on the instant application that would extend to the expiration date of the full statutory term as defined in 35 U.S.C. 154 to 156 and 173 of any patent granted on the second application, as shortened by any terminal disclaimer filed prior to the patent grant, in the event that any such granted patent: expires for failure to pay a maintenance fee, is held unenforceable, is found invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, is statutorily disclaimed in whole or terminally disclaimed under 37 CFR 1.321, has all claims canceled by a reexamination certificate, is reissued, or is in any manner terminated prior to the expiration of its full statutory term as shortened by any terminal disclaimer filed prior to its grant.</p> <p>Check either box 1 or 2 below, if appropriate.</p> <p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> For submissions on behalf of an organization (e.g., corporation, partnership, university, government agency, etc.), the undersigned is empowered to act on behalf of the organization.</p> <p>I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The undersigned is an attorney or agent of record.</p> <p>_____ Signature _____ Date _____</p> <p>_____ Typed or printed name _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Terminal disclaimer fee under 37 CFR 1.20(d) is included.</p> <p><b>WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.</b></p> <p>*Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is required if terminal disclaimer is signed by the assignee (owner). Form PTO/SB/96 may be used for making this statement. See MPEP § 324.</p>	

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 3.73(b)

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_

Application No.: \_\_\_\_\_ Filed: \_\_\_\_\_

For: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_, a \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of Assignee) (Type of Assignee, e.g., corporation, partnership, university, government agency, etc.)

certifies that it is the assignee of the entire right, title and interest in the patent application identified above by virtue of either:

A.  An assignment from the inventor(s) of the patent application identified above. The assignment was recorded in the Patent and Trademark Office at Reel \_\_\_\_\_, Frame \_\_\_\_\_, or for which a copy thereof is attached.

OR

B.  A chain of title from the inventor(s), of the patent application identified above, to the current assignee as shown below:

1. From: \_\_\_\_\_ To: \_\_\_\_\_  
The document was recorded in the Patent and Trademark Office at  
Reel \_\_\_\_\_, Frame \_\_\_\_\_, or for which a copy thereof is attached.

2. From: \_\_\_\_\_ To: \_\_\_\_\_  
The document was recorded in the Patent and Trademark Office at  
Reel \_\_\_\_\_, Frame \_\_\_\_\_, or for which a copy thereof is attached.

3. From: \_\_\_\_\_ To: \_\_\_\_\_  
The document was recorded in the Patent and Trademark Office at  
Reel \_\_\_\_\_, Frame \_\_\_\_\_, or for which a copy thereof is attached.

Additional documents in the chain of title are listed on a supplemental sheet.

Copies of assignments or other documents in the chain of title are attached.

The undersigned has reviewed all the documents in the chain of title of the patent application identified above and, to the best of undersigned's knowledge and belief, title is in the assignee identified above.

The undersigned (whose title is supplied below) is empowered to act on behalf of the assignee.

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true, and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further, that these statements are made with the knowledge that willful false statements, and the like so made, are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001, Title 18 of the United States Code, and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing thereon.

Date : \_\_\_\_\_

Name : \_\_\_\_\_

Title : \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_